R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 018 172 FL 000 837

HISTORY OF THE LINGUISTIC INSTITUTE.

BY- HILL, ARCHIBALD A.
INDIANA UNIV., BLOOMINGTON, RES. CTR. IN ANTHROP.

PUB DATE 63

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.76 17P.

DESCRIPTORS- *HISTORICAL REVIEWS, *LINGUISTICS, *INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS), *LANGUAGE PROGRAMS, *UNCOMMONLY TAUGHT LANGUAGES, HIGHER EDUCATION, SUMMER INSTITUTES, LINGUISTIC INSTITUTE, INDIANA UNIVERSITY,

THIS HISTORY, CONTAINED IN THE 1964 BULLETIN OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY LINGUISTIC INSTITUTE, GIVES AN ACCOUNT OF THE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTITUTE FROM ITS FOUNDATION (IN 1928) AND EARLY SESSIONS UNDER THE DIRECTORSHIP OF EDGAR H. STURTEVANT. IT OFFERS A CONDENSED, YEAR-BY-YEAR DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTITUTE'S ACTIVITIES, MAKING NOTE OF SPECIAL FEATURES OF EACH SESSION, DISTINGUISHED CHAIRMEN AND PARTICIPANTS, AND NOTABLE SCHOLARLY INNOVATIONS, SUCH AS EDWARD SAPIR'S CONTRIBUTIONS IN AMERICAN INDIAN LANGUAGES, RESEARCH ON THE LINGUISTIC ATLAS OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA, AND THE IMPACT OF TRANSFORMATIONAL ANALYSIS. (RW)

ED018172

16

FL 000 837

History of the Linguistic Institute

ARCHIBALD A. HILL, *Secretary-Treasurer*
LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA

TWO OF THE MAIN AIMS of the Linguistic Society have always been spreading of knowledge of linguistics, and the recruitment and training of linguistic scholars. In the organization meeting of the Society, Professor Gerig of Columbia called attention to both needs; and in the first number of *Language*, Leonard Bloomfield concluded his essay, "Why A Linguistic Society," with these words which still challenge the linguistic community: "Not only the furtherance of our science, but also the needs of society, make it the duty of students of language to work together systematically and with that sense of craftsmanship and of obligation which is called professional consciousness." The Linguistic Institute has been, and one hopes always will be, the principal means by which this aim is approached.

A first step toward achieving this goal was a survey of the opportunities for linguistic training, compiled by Roland G. Kent and Edgar Sturtevant and published as *Bulletin 1*. The authors remarked—with considerable moderation—that the opportunities for linguistic education were inadequate and unequally distributed. How inadequate they were is shown by the fact that in 1926 there were but eleven courses in general linguistics and five in American Indian languages.

The second step, and an immeasurably great one, was the foundation of the Linguistic Institute.

The first intimation of such a plan appears in an announcement in the December, 1927, issue of *Language,* in which it is pointed out that support from the members of the Society would be necessary if the step was to be undertaken. The story is fully told in *Bulletin 2,* written by Roland G. Kent. The original suggestion came from R. E. Saleski, Professor of German at Bethany College, and was "for a gathering of scholars for interchange of ideas, [rather] than for the holding of courses, though the latter was not excluded." Kent remarks that the Executive Committee was about evenly divided on the proposal, but that Professor Edgar H. Sturtevant "took up the idea with energy . . . and elaborated the plan into . . . virtually the form in which it has been put into effect." To any of the many who saw Professor Sturtevant working with untiring devotion for linguistics and the Institute, even many years later, the statement that he took up the idea with energy is pregnant. There can be no doubt of the identity of the real founder of the Linguistic Institute. The first period of Institute history was the four years during which the Institute was under the directorship of Professor Sturtevant, for the first two years at Yale and for the third and fourth at City College in New York.

A human touch is given by Professor Kent's account of the difficulty of securing a faculty for the first session: "Many scholars had . . . already obligated themselves for other summer sessions, or were planning to spend the summer in Europe; still others felt the need of a complete rest during the summer." This statement brings with it nostalgia for a day when travel abroad was not the strenuous activity of organizing linguistic programs in Poona, Taipei, or Cairo.

A FURTHER TOUCH is that preliminary costs of circularization and organization were guaranteed by a group of thirty-two of the most distinguished members of the Society. It is a pleasure to find among

them the names of Boas, Bloomfield, and Sapir, the three men often taken to be the founders of all that is most distinctive in American linguistics. The first Institute was held as planned and ran for six weeks. There were 39 courses, 24 faculty members, and 45 students. As Kent remarked, "A school with only two students to every teacher must be branded a failure. But it was not as a school that the Institute was first conceived; it was planned to be a conference of scholars. . . . Many of the courses took the form of conferences where every one learned from every other, whichever one might be the nominal leader of the group." Exactly this spirit has marked every Institute and characterized most of the courses ever since. Even with the self-sacrificing spirit of the faculty, the first session would not have been possible without a grant of $2,500 from the American Council of Learned Societies, a grant which initiated support from that body which has been unflagging and devoted ever since.

Among the most popular of the courses at the first session was Gothic. Such popularity in part reflected the historical interests of the linguists of the day, but even more it was due to the fact that the course was taught by Professor Hermann Collitz of the Johns Hopkins University. His presence on this first faculty firmly links the Linguistic Institute and American linguistics with the great tradition of the neogrammarians. Among the courses which seem most prophetic of later interests was Methods of Studying Unrecorded Languages, offered by the distinguished anthropologist, John Alden Mason of the Pennsylvania Museum. Under this title it is not hard to recognize the presently more familiar Field Methods.

The first session, like all since, was accompanied by public lectures on live issues in linguistics, such as one which must have been provocative, The Fallacy of the Vowel Triangle, by Professor G. Oscar Russell. A second feature of the first session was that it established relations with research activities beyond its own classrooms, a tradition which has flourished

steadily since. The Institute stood as sponsor to a committee headed by Professor Boas and financed by Carnegie Corporations funds, which carried on research on six American Indian languages and continued research on four of them in 1928. The second session was again held at Yale, under a subvention of $1,000 from Yale and $4,000 from the Carnegie Corporation. Further, through the efforts of Professor Prokosch two fellowships were secured from Sigma Epsilon Pi, an honor society in Germanics. The great achievement of this session was the holding of a conference on a proposal for a *Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada.* The conference was attended by fifty leading scholars and was sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies. As Professor Kurath, the later Editor of the *Atlas,* reported, the conference resulted in plans for training field workers, methods of recording, and the maintenance of an archive.

THE THIRD SESSION was held at the College of the City of New York, again for a period of six weeks. As Kent's history of the session says, "no subvention could be expected from the moneyed foundations." Thus the generosity of President Robinson of City College in assuming responsibility for stipends must have been doubly welcome. Professor Prokosch secured four lectureships of $500 each from private sources, and one of these was used to bring Professor Jules Marouzeau as Albert Blum Lecturer from the University of Paris. Visits from abroad have constituted one of the chief ways in which the Institute has contributed to understanding between American and European linguists. A forward-looking enterprise at this session was the establishment of two courses of popularization, Linguistics in High School Latin and The Classical Element in English.

The fourth and last session of the original series was remarkable for the close and fruitful cooperation with the *Linguistic Atlas.* A subvention of $2,000

from the ACLS was used to bring Dr. Jakob Jud, Editor of the *Italian Dialect Atlas,* and Mr. Paul Scheuermeier, his field worker, to teach a course in the problems of preparing an atlas. This course was supported by others, such as Professor Alexander's Modern British and American Pronunciation and Professor Orbeck's History of American Dialects. Further, Professor Cabell Greet's course in Phonetics, at Columbia, was open to Institute members. As a result of this careful planning of courses and a regular series of meetings of the personnel involved, the session gave invaluable training to the *Atlas* workers, such as Bernard Bloch, Guy S. Lowman, and Martin Joos. The fruit of this training, of course, was in the final publication of one of the great American research works, the *Atlas of New England.*

In spite of the scholarly success of the Institute and the modest but steady growth of an endowment fund, the report on the fourth session closes with the melancholy recommendation that there be no Institute in 1932, since "we find it increasingly difficult to get first-rate scholars to teach . . . at stipends of $400.00 or less." There is perhaps an echo of the spirit of those who made the early Institutes possible in Professor Sturtevant's use of a military figure, "We expected to secure new scholars so that each one might have frequent furloughs." Then, as now, linguists show the devotion of soldiers in a holy war.

While it was hoped that the Institute would soon be revived, the continuing world-wide depression made it seem that the Institute was forever gone. It would not have been renewed had it not been for the vision and energy of a single scholar, to whom, in consequence, linguistics and the American academic world owe a great debt. That scholar was Charles C. Fries of Michigan. In April of 1935 Professor Sturtevant reported that he and the Secretary of the Society had met in Ann Arbor with Professor Fries and that as a result a revived Institute would take place in 1936 "with a large number of courses

in languages, offered by the local faculty and two scholars invited from outside [and a] series of public lectures . . . by faculty members and invited scholars." In short, the Institute was revivified as nearly as possible on the original plan. As a result the Society contributed $300 from the endowment funds toward the lecture series.

WITH THIS SESSION the Institute entered into its second phase, during which it was continuously under the direction of Professor Fries at Ann Arbor for a period of five years through the summer of 1940. Among the innovations was the adoption of an eight-week session instead of the previous six. The eight-week session has been usual, though not universal, since. A second innovation was the welcoming of Ph.D. guests without fee, one of the most valued of the Institute's now permanent policies. Professor Fries was also responsible for the establishment of luncheon meetings at which "the discussions . . . were vigorous and intelligent, [so that] not infrequently the lecturer as well as the audience profited by [them]." Though there is no record of it, it is safe to say that still more informal and in its way equally profitable discussion must have taken place at Metzger's, as it did in later Institutes. An anecdote which survives from the first Ann Arbor session is Professor Sturtevant's reassuring letter to his family, pointing out that his conduct was guaranteed, since he was to live in Church Street, eat at the Apostle's Club, and teach in Angell Hall. This series of Institutes introduced courses making use of the results of the *Linguistic Atlas* research over the last six years. These results were made available by Professor Kurath and also by Professor Bloch.

The session of 1937 was remarkable for the participation of Professor Edward Sapir, who gave two courses, Field Methods in Linguistics and Phonetics of Navaho. During this session there were public lectures on Algonquian by Bloomfield, the New Hebrew by Zellig Harris, the Menzerath-

Junker X-ray pictures of the speech organs, with a comment by Bernard Bloch, Indo-European laryngeals by Edward Sapir, and many more. In 1938 the lecturers included such distinguished scholars as Emeneau, Li, Hahn, Bloomfield, Swadesh, and Pike. In 1939 there were talks on Egyptian and Old Persian by Edgerton and Kent, respectively, and reports on field work on Delaware, Tamil, and Lithuanian by Voegelin, Emeneau, and Trager. In short, the distinguished tradition of lectures and discussion was firmly established during this period.

The session of 1938 was notable in that it established the practice of a summer meeting of the Society, to be held each year in conjunction with the Institute, and which has always been the climax of the eight weeks of activity. The session of 1940 added a conference on non-English European languages spoken in America and emphasized such newer aspects of linguistics as the use of mechanical means of recording and analysis, and the bearing of laryngeals on the comparative grammar of Indo-European.

Since the Institute of 1940 ended the period of five years agreed on between the Society and the University of Michigan, the whole question of the future of the Institute was reviewed for the Society by Professors Sturtevant and Kent and published in *Bulletin 13*. In his history of the Institute, which formed the first part of this *Bulletin*, Professor Sturtevant said:

> [The Linguistic Institutes] assist in training graduate students in linguistics. In part, of course, they duplicate work given in many graduate schools, but a considerable number of courses cover subjects that are treated in few American universities. Even such important matters as the comparative grammar of Greek and of Latin are now omitted by several of the foremost graduate schools, although they profess to provide satisfactory training for the Ph.D. in Greek and Latin. Besides the Institute has included such courses as American English, History of American Dialects, American Dialect Geography, Old Irish, The Language of the Homeric Poems, Hittite, Comparative Semitic Grammar, History of the Egyptian

> Language, Field Methods in Linguistics, Problems in the Preparation of a Linguistic Atlas. These topics are adequately treated in only a few American universities, and some of them nowhere in the country except at the Linguistic Institute; some, indeed, nowhere else in the world.

While not necessarily true for just this list of courses, the statement is still conspicuously true for the courses offered at current Institutes. Sturtevant went on to give praise to the cross-fertilization which discussion brought about between various schools of linguistics, and the stimulation the Institute gave to the study of American dialects and of unrecorded languages. A concluding statement is significant:

> The Institute has also stimulated research in other directions. A dozen or more papers on Hittite have been written by scholars who have studied Hittite at the Linguistic Institute, and it is reasonably certain that most of these would not have been written if the Institute had not existed.

The concluding part of the report consisted of discussion of the 175 replies to a questionnaire on the value and future of the Institute which had been sent out to its former members. These replies were so overwhelmingly enthusiastic that it was decided to disregard the shrinkage in enrollment (the high in students had been 204 in 1938; the Institute of 1940 had 122) and make every effort to continue the sessions on the same plan. However, if for no other reason than to show the genuineness of the replies, one which read as follows was included: "I heard about phonemes and morphemes and similar gaga." The most impressive of the replies came from the Wycliffe Bible Translators at their own Summer Institute. Kent printed it entire, and concluded with the remark "Suppose Bishop Ulfilas had attended a Linguistic Institute!"

The third phase of Institute history consequently begins with its move for two years to the University of North Carolina, where it was directed by Professor Urban T. Holmes. In spite of the pressure of war, a generous list of courses, thirty in 1941 and twenty-six in 1942, was given, and the faculties

numbered 17 with 10 visitors, and 15 with 8 visitors. The course most widely attended and most fully discussed was that in Introduction to Linguistic Science, given by Professor Sturtevant. Interest in this course was natural, both for the eminence of the instructor and for the rapid changes which linguistics was undergoing at the time. A result of the widespread discussion of basic concepts was that the University newspaper, relying a little unwisely on Webster's second, defined *phoneme* as an "auditory hallucination of voices and spoken words." A second strength of these two Institutes was in Celtic, under the leadership of Professors Holmes and Dillon, culminating in a lecture at the second session at which Professors "Goetze and Dillon united to show the resemblances within the IE framework between Hittite and Old Irish." The management of these two Institutes, during which "the shadow of war was never far away," was difficult, and the Society's thanks to North Carolina and to its neighbor Duke was particularly heartfelt.

In 1943 and 1944 the Institute was at Wisconsin, under the direction of Professor Einar Haugen. Pressure of war limited the faculty, courses, and attendance; yet even under pressure the attendance was approximately 70. Further, the Institute justified its wartime existence by demonstrating the teaching of languages by the intensive method. Courses so taught formed models for military courses set up at other institutions and indeed came to be known as the "Army method." The Director said:

> In a day when America is waking up to the fact that it is no longer isolated, this renaissance of interest in remote languages and the principles of linguistic science is of deep significance. Our civilization will be the richer for it, and the University of Wisconsin is happy to have a share in the promotion of this spirit.

A glimpse of the high morale of these Institutes and of the so-called Army method operating in its original habitat is in the following statement:

> The class which attracted most attention, if only because of its high auditory perceptibility and willingness to burst into song on the least occasion, was the Chinese course, in which Professor Twaddell was assisted by three Chinese informants . . .

Yet though these wartime Institutes were necessarily practical in tone, there were members who came for the purpose of increasing knowledge of linguistics, rather than direct and immediate contribution to the war effort. There was even one teacher of music who attended because he enjoyed linguistics, which gave him "rest and relaxation and kept [his] mind alert."

For the years from 1945 through 1950, the Institute returned to the ever-hospitable University of Michigan. The first two of these Institutes belong together, since they were both carried out under wartime conditions, with restrictions on travel and government demands on personnel. As a result the usual summer meeting had to be omitted in 1945, and as might have been expected, once more the Institutes concentrated on practical aims:

> The war has made necessary practical contacts with a great variety of languages that were little known to the general public before. The armed services needed a great many men and women who were trained to speak and understand these languages as well as the languages of the European countries which were the center of the war in the west. As a result of the language needs of the various government services, there has been tremendous emphasis upon the teaching and learning of foreign languages. The intensive language program of the American Council of Learned Societies has dealt effectively with many of the exotic languages. The Army Specialized Training Program attempted to teach foreign languages to great numbers of men. These programs have stimulated considerable discussion of what has been called a "new approach" to language teaching. The Linguistic Institute, therefore, will devote considerable attention to the contemporary trends in language teaching. There will be a symposium in which the recent developments are discussed in full and demonstration courses in which the materials and techniques of the "new approach" are employed.

Though the teaching of foreign languages was the principal direction in which the Institute moved in

1945, there was one Luncheon Conference with an oddly prophetic title—"Lieutenant Charles F. Hockett: English Syntax of Transformation." In addition, the lectures contained the first appearance of what has come to be the most theatrically and linguistically effective performance of many Institutes, Professor Pike's "Demonstration of an Introductory Analysis of a Language Unknown to the Linguist."

In 1946 the Institute continued its interest in language teaching, but also directed a large part of its effort to assessing the effect of recently developed analytic techniques upon the traditional, historical study of language. In this year it was possible to renew the summer meeting of the Society. The return of interest in older types of linguistic study is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that there were so many requests for a class in Sanskrit that it was taught by Professor Hoenigswald, even though it had been planned to omit it, since it had been offered in 1945.

The Institute for 1947 was the first of the series under the direction of Professor Kurath, the Editor of the *Atlas*. This Institute also directed itself toward unifying the science of language, after the important new developments in the war years. It was, for instance, during this Institute that the term "structural analysis" came to replace the previously generally used "descriptive analysis." It was to Professor Kurath that the forums, in which issues in linguistics were widely and searchingly discussed, came to be a feature of the sessions. It was also to Professor Kurath that one of the most pleasant features of Ann Arbor sessions was due—weekend visits to one of the nearby lakes for swimming and more discussion. It was also in Professor Kurath's first term as Director that our distinguished former President and later Collitz Professor, Miss Hahn, achieved a victory in the emancipation of women by marching determinedly through the previously exclusively male front door of the Michigan Union.

THE INSTITUTE FOR 1948 was distinguished by the presence on its faculty of the late Professor J. R. Firth of London. His visit was for many American linguists their only opportunity to become directly acquainted with the personality and theories of the great exponent of prosodic analysis. It is an amusing sidelight on his visit that he was met in New York by our member of long standing, John Kepke. Firth not unnaturally got the name as Kipke and was astonished that he should have been met by the Michigan football coach. Still another sidelight of this Institute is the Michigan staff's decision to put Professors Hull and Hill into the same office, so that thereafter they could be designated "die Ableute." And a final feature of this session was the softball game, at which Professor Yamagiwa demonstrated his mastery of pitches, both Japanese and American.

The two most significant statements about this Institute, however, are the following:

> Professor E. H. Sturtevant of Yale University occupied the Hermann Collitz Professorship in Comparative Indo-European Grammar in the Linguistic Institute, which has been established by the Linguistic Society. It is supported by the income from the estate of the late Professor Hermann Collitz of the Johns Hopkins University and his wife Klara Collitz, and will be filled each year that the Institute meets.

No more fitting holder of the first appointment could have been found. The second significant statement follows:

> The Administrative Committee is following a policy of rotating the staff so that in the course of three or four sessions scholars from nearly all the American universities offering advanced work in linguistics will teach in the Institute. As a result, the work of the Institute has become intimately known in all of these institutions, and students are encouraged by their professors to attend the Institute. There is hardly a major university in the country that has not sent advanced graduate students to the Institute at one time or another, and some of these universities send one or more students each year. The Institute thus serves to round out the training of young scholars in linguistics in all parts of the country.

True as Professor Kurath's statement is, it still does not point out that the value of the Institute is not only in training students on the advanced graduate level. Many students have come to the Institute when they were still undergraduates, or graduate students not yet committed to linguistics. The Institute is a ladder with rungs at all heights.

In the Institute of 1949 a feature of the session was the presence of Professors A. W. de Groot of the University of Amsterdam (Co-Editor of *Lingua*), Angus McIntosh of the University of Edinburgh (member of a committee planning a dialect survey of Scotland), and Veikko Väänänen of the University of Helsinki, all of whom came to this country on Fulbright or Rockefeller grants and participated in the activities of the Institute for several weeks. The session of 1950 marked the last under the unbroken sponsorship of Michigan. It is therefore pleasant to notice that it was well attended, having 193 members. The Collitz chair was held by Émile Benveniste of the Collège de France; a second distinguished foreign visitor was Shirô Hattori of Tokyo University.

The session for 1951 represented a radical departure in that it was held in Berkeley on the campus of the University of California. The decision to move from Michigan was not arrived at without serious discussion, since many members of the Society felt that Michigan, by its continued hospitality during difficult days for the Institute, had earned a prescriptive right to permanent possession of the Institute. The final decision, however, is one which has guided the Society ever since in placing the Institute—that the holding of an Institute is an honor to a university and a recognition of its achievement in linguistic education, and that the honor should be moved about from time to time in order to further education and research in linguistics in various parts of the country. It was in this spirit, and as a recognition of its long tradition in linguistics, that the LSA accepted the invitation of the University of California. The Director of the Institute in

Berkeley was C. Douglas Chrétien, and the holder of the Collitz chair was Miss Hahn. A melancholy event of the session was the serious illness of the Associate Director, Professor Sturtevant. A special feature was a symposium on American Indian languages, peculiarly appropriate in view of the devoted work of California scholars in this field.

In 1952 and 1953 two very lively Institutes were held at Indiana University under the directorship of C. F. Voegelin. These Institutes followed a pattern which has often been used, in that the strictly linguistic work was both years supported by interdisciplinary conferences, a Conference of Anthropologists and Linguists, a Conference on Archiving Languages, and a Seminar in Psycholinguistics sponsored by the Social Science Research Council. All three of these conferences resulted in publications associated with the *International Journal of American Linguistics.* An important innovation of these two sessions, furthermore, was that both instituted courses in linguistics and literature, a field which has regularly been explored since and in which it has been possible at least to accomplish something more than the once notorious activity of counting final *e*'s in Chaucer.

During the next two years the Society launched an experiment in multiple Institutes, one at the University of Chicago, one at Michigan, and one at the Institute of Languages and Linguistics of Georgetown University. The Directors were George V. Bobrinskoy, Joseph K. Yamagiwa, and Archibald A. Hill, respectively; and for the first year the Collitz chair (held by George S. Lane) and the summer meeting were at Chicago, thus constituting this the main Institute. It is not possible to arrive at completely comparable figures on courses and registration, but the motivation for multiple Institutes is evident from the fact that courses and registration at each were about comparable to that of the single Institutes of earlier years. A feature of these Institutes was that

though each Institute offered the basic courses, each specialized in advanced work: Chicago in ancient and American Indian languages, Michigan in linguistic geography and the English language, Georgetown in Chinese, Scandinavian, and American Indian structures. A further feature of this program was that Chicago instituted the practice followed regularly since, of having a Collitz Lecture by the holder of that chair. The second year of multiple Institutes was similar, except that the Directors at Chicago and Michigan were Messrs. Metcalf and Marckwardt. Once again the three Institutes endeavored to avoid unnecessary duplication, with Michigan working in the English language, practical language teaching, and linguistic geography; Chicago in the ancient and American languages; and Georgetown in Oriental languages, with an innovation in that linguistic geography was offered on the basis of Arabic dialects. This year the summer meeting and the Collitz chair (held by Henry Hoenigswald) were at Georgetown.

After this year the policy of multiple Institutes was regretfully abandoned, owing primarily to the fact that universities felt the need of the cachet of a single Institute as a talking point in setting up language programs. It is striking, however, that the real goal of the multiple Institute program has been accomplished, since there are now each year language programs at a number of American universities which are fully worthy of being placed beside the Linguistic Institute, even though that institution is still clearly *primus inter pares*. Another point that must once again be mentioned is that the Society and American education are both clearly indebted to the University of Michigan, which not only cooperates fully with all other universities holding Institutes, but has let it be known that it will invite the Institute in any year when suitable invitations elsewhere are not available. In watching over the future of the Institute, the Society has now adopted the policy of holding it for two years, when possible, at any new university.

In accord with this policy the Institute returned to Michigan for the years of 1956 through 1959 under the direction of Professor Marckwardt. A notable feature of the Institute for 1957 was the establishment of courses which constituted a program in mechanical translation and computer analysis under the sponsorship of the National Science Foundation. A pleasant innovation of the 1958 session was the receipt of a direct subsidy from the Ford Foundation, since heretofore all aid had been in the form of fellowships. The four years from 1956 though 1959 were years of steady building and consolidation rather than years of startling innovation. The directorship of Professor Marckwardt was one of efficiency and good will, high at the start but growing steadily.

The years 1960 and 1961 were the first since the single session at Berkeley in which the Institute ventured west of the Mississippi. These two sessions were held at the University of Texas under the directorship of the Secretary of the Society, Archibald A. Hill. Academically, these were the years in which the full impact of transformational analysis was for the first time felt by the linguistic community, and the Institute did its best to see that transformational analysts were fully heard. Indeed, the campus joke of those years was that linguists were divided into transformers, resistors, and transistors. Aside from this new direction, there was an innovation in that in 1961 the Society devoted the income from the Linguistic Institute endowment to supplementing the salary of a regular staff member, the supplemented emolument to constitute the Linguistic Society Professorship. The first holder of the Linguistic Society chair was W. Sidney Allen of Cambridge. The two Collitz chairs were held by Eric Hamp of Chicago and Alf Sommerfelt of Oslo. A further feature of the period of the Institute at Texas was that it constituted a reaffirmation of the policy of holding the Institute two years in succession at new host universities. It was this reaffirmation which made pos-

sible the two-year stay of the Institute at the next host institution, the University of Washington in Seattle. These last two Institutes were held under the directorship of Professor Sol Saporta, and it might be said that at least for the first of them a World's Fair served as a sideshow. The success of the two Washington Institutes is in large measure due to the foresight of the University of Washington in bringing Professor Bloch of Yale, Editor of *Language* and a veteran of many Institutes, to the campus as a visiting professor during the academic year to act as an informal adviser in preparing the two summer sessions. It is a pleasure to point out that distant as Seattle is from the Eastern and Midwestern universities where linguistic students have previously been at least supposed to be concentrated, there were a total of 126 students. The fear that Institutes would wither if held too far from the Atlantic coast seems finally laid to rest; and as the Institute prepares for its session of 1964, linguists look forward with confidence to a session drawing students from Portland in Maine and in Oregon, from San Diego in California and in Texas, and from New Haven, Ann Arbor, Philadelphia, and New York.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

LITHO IN U. S. A.